

~~SECRET~~

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Monday - 17 June 1974

Page 2

25X1
25X1
4. [] Met separately with Ed Braswell and Clark McFadden, Senate Armed Services Committee staff, to leave with them the revision of the Director's letter to Chairman Stennis on the Proxmire amendments to the National Security Act and we discussed the concerns which Mr. Colby expressed in the letter. Braswell expressed some reservations about the conference report language which we had recommended, but McFadden later told me that if language was to be inserted in the conference report, he preferred the language we had suggested to the longer statements that appeared in the Director's letter. It is clear that the Committee staffers (undoubtedly reflecting Stennis' view) are very reluctant to report back to the Senate any language from the conference which Senator Proxmire will consider to be an abandonment by the Senate conferees of language agreed to on the Senate floor. Braswell and McFadden are interested in any material we can give them (especially for use when the bill is reported back to the Senate) in arguing in favor of our position, i. e., examples of the "support structure" referred to in the Director's letter and the list of domestic activities which can be used on the Senate floor as illustrative of the types of activities which have been curtailed pursuant to the philosophy of the Stennis/Proxmire amendments.

25X1
5. [] Later in the day, Clark McFadden called to say that in reviewing the Proxmire amendment more carefully he was somewhat inclined to the position that activities such as technical assistance given to the FBI in counterintelligence programs against foreigners were by definition foreign intelligence programs and therefore excluded from the prohibition of the Proxmire amendment by definition. If this theory is pursued it would be unnecessary to highlight the concern which the Director expressed in his letter to Stennis on Friday. I told McFadden it would be nice if we could slide through on this kind of philosophy but I wondered how much support we would get from our Committee if this became a public issue. I said I thought we would feel more comfortable if some clarifying language was included in the conference report. McFadden suggested the possibility of stating the position of the conferees that the amendment pertained only to internal security, police and law enforcement activities and was not intended to preclude foreign intelligence. I told McFadden I would discuss this with our people and be back in touch with him.

~~SECRET~~